

**REMARKS**

In the present Amendment, Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 4, which was dependent on Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 4 has been canceled.

Claim 1 has been further amended to recite that the melt kneading is carried out in an extruder having a first-half melt kneading zone and a latter-half melt kneading zone, the temperature in the latter-half melt kneading zone being higher than that in the first-half melt kneading zone. Support for this further amendment to Claim 1 is found, for example, in the paragraph bridging pages 12-13 of the present specification.

No new matter has been added, and entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested. Upon entry of the Amendment, Claims 1-3 and 5 will be pending.

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, Claims 1-5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0161131 ("Kitano").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the following reasons. Kitano does not disclose or render obvious the process for producing a modified polyethylene resin according to the present claims.

Applicants' process for producing a modified polyethylene resin is patentable over Kitano, *at least because* Kitano fails to disclose or suggest carrying out melt kneading in an extruder having a first-half melt kneading zone and a latter-half melt kneading zone, the temperature in the latter-half melt kneading zone being higher than that in the first-half melt kneading zone, as is recited by present Claim 1.

Further, the present claimed invention, in particular, the wherein clause now recited in Claim 1, unexpectedly provides a process for producing a modified polyethylene resin having only a small degree of melt index-lowering.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102 rejection of Claims 1-5 based on Kitano.

In paragraph 7 of the Office Action, Claims 1-5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,616,059 ("Motooka").

Applicants also respectfully traverse this rejection.

Motooka does not disclose or render obvious the process for producing a modified polyethylene resin according to the present claims.

Applicants' process for producing a modified polyethylene resin is patentable over Motooka, *at least because* Motooka fails to disclose or suggest carrying out melt kneading in an extruder having a first-half melt kneading zone and a latter-half melt kneading zone, the temperature in the latter-half melt kneading zone being higher than that in the first-half melt kneading zone, as is recited by present claim 1.

Again, as discussed above, the present claimed invention, in particular, the wherein clause now recited in Claim 1, unexpectedly provides a process for producing a modified polyethylene resin having only a small degree of melt index-lowering.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 rejection of Claims 1-5 based on Motooka.

Allowance of Claims 1-3 and 5 is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
Application No.: 10/800,672

Attorney Docket No.: Q80286

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John T. Callahan  
Registration No. 32,607

Date: June 5, 2007